

1 Neel Chatterjee (SBN 173985)  
*nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com*  
2 James Lin (SBN 310440)  
*jlin@goodwinlaw.com*  
3 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**  
135 Commonwealth Drive  
4 Menlo Park, California 94025  
Tel.: +1 650 752 3100  
5 Fax.: +1 650 853 1038

6 Brett Schuman (SBN 189247)  
*bschuman@goodwinlaw.com*  
7 Shane Brun (SBN 179079)  
*sbrun@goodwinlaw.com*  
8 Rachel M. Walsh (SBN 250568)  
*rwalsh@goodwinlaw.com*  
9 Hayes P. Hyde (SBN 308031)  
*hhyde@goodwinlaw.com*  
10 **GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**  
11 Three Embarcadero Center  
12 San Francisco, California 94111  
Tel.: +1 415 733 6000  
Fax.: +1 415 677 9041

Hong-An Vu (SBN 266268)  
*hvu@goodwinlaw.com*

13 [www.goodwin.com](http://www.goodwin.com)  
**GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**  
14 601 S. Figueroa Street, 41st Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
15 Tel.: +1 213 426 2500  
Fax.: +1 213 623 1673

<sup>16</sup> Attorneys for Defendant: Otto Trucking LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

WAYMO LLC.

**Plaintiff,**

V.

22 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.;  
23 OTTOMOTTO LLC; OTTO TRUCKING  
LLC

### Defendants.

Case No. 3:17-cv-00939-WHA

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION IN LIMINE NO.  
26 TO EXCLUDE REFERENCE TO  
DOWNLOADING OF 14,000 FILES**

Courtroom: 8, 19th Floor  
Judge: The Honorable William Alsup  
Hearing Date: September 20, 2017  
Hearing Time: 8:00 a.m.

Trial: October 10, 2017

Filed/Lodged Concurrently with:

**Head-Ledged Case**

**1. Declaration**

**2. Proposed Order**

[Redacted Version of Document  
Sought to be Sealed]

1       From the beginning, Waymo has made its misappropriation of trade secrets claim about Mr.  
 2 Levandowski's alleged improper downloading of 14,000 files from Waymo's SVN server. *See*  
 3 Compl. at ¶¶4, 44. It has called them the "crown jewels of the kind of technology that we are talking  
 4 about [autonomous driving]." 8/16/17 Hr'g at 71:1-12. This was a lie and part of Google's attempt to  
 5 eliminate a competitor in the self-driving automobile space.

6       Sasha Zbrozek, the engineer responsible for setting up the repository for the 14,000 files and  
 7 a prolific user of the SVN repository himself, told Waymo's counsel that the SVN files are "low-  
 8 value." Vu Decl. Ex. 1. This comment led Waymo's counsel to acknowledge that they [REDACTED]

9 [REDACTED] the exact opposite of what Waymo's counsel told this Court. *Id.* at Ex. 2 at 84497  
 10 (emphasis added). Moreover, Mr. Zbrozek informed counsel that Mr. Levandowski's access of the  
 11 SVN server and downloading the full repository of documents "[d]oesn't ring the alarm bells for  
 12 me." Vu Decl., Ex. 2. Indeed, Mr. Zbrozek could not have been any clearer:

13 [REDACTED]  
 14 [REDACTED]  
 15 [REDACTED] Vu Decl., Ex. 4 at 86936.

16       Waymo ignored the statements by Mr. Zbrozek and filed this lawsuit. It went so far as to  
 17 successfully move for a preliminary injunction based on the alleged downloading of the 14,000 files.  
 18 At the same time, Waymo hid Mr. Zbrozek's identity—submitting declarations by witnesses with no  
 19 personal knowledge of the SVN server; failing to disclose Mr. Zbrozek in the initial disclosures (or  
 20 any other discovery), failing to search his documents; and asserting privilege over communications  
 21 with Mr. Zbrozek. Otto Trucking only received in unredacted form the communications between  
 22 Waymo's counsel and Mr. Zbrozek on September 2, 2017—after discovery closed and multiple  
 23 proceedings to compel Waymo's production of documents relating to its investigation due to its  
 24 selective waiver of privilege.

25       This case has been based on a lie. The 14,000 files are not trade secrets. Their downloading  
 26 was not evidence of misconduct. Waymo has tried to hide a key witness and documents that  
 27 contradict its narrative. The Court should preclude Waymo from referencing Mr. Levandowski's  
 28 downloading of 14,000 files. In the alternative, the Court should prohibit Waymo from introducing

1 evidence or argument that the downloading activity was anomalous.

2 **I. THE 14,000 FILES CONTAIN “LOW-VALUE” INFORMATION AND THE  
3 DOWNLOAD WAS NOT UNUSUAL**

4 Anthony Levandowski left Google on January 27, 2016. Google initiated an investigation on  
5 February 3, 2016, but did not implement preservation protocols, including turning off the SVN  
6 server’s automatic destruction policy. *See Vu Decl. Ex. 5; Ex. 6; see also Ex. 10.* This resulted in  
7 the loss of SVN data from before September 19, 2015 for Anthony Levandowski and other  
8 employees from before May 2016. *See Ex. 10.* Google’s investigators analyzed images of Mr.  
9 Levandowski’s laptops, but did not find that its trade secrets had been compromised. *See id. Ex. 14.*

10 After outside litigation counsel from Keker & Van Nest (“KVN”) joined the investigation,  
11 Waymo analyzed activity log data, including log data associated with the SVN server. When Tom  
12 Gorman, an attorney at KVN, discovered that Mr. Levandowski accessed the SVN server on  
13 December 15 and downloaded the repository of documents, he began to seek corroboration of his  
14 conclusion that misconduct had occurred. In response to Mr. Gorman’s questions about files at issue  
15 and whether Mr. Levandowski’s alleged downloading of the entire repository was suspicious, Mr.  
16 Zbrozek, the former SVN administrator who set up the SVN server, responded:

- 17 • “It’s all electronics designs – schematics and PCB layouts, and the component library for  
18 their creation. It was considered low-value enough that we even considered hosting it off of  
19 Google infrastructure.” *Id.*
- 20 • “It’s not particularly surprising that he might check things out once . . . Doesn’t ring alarm  
21 bells for me.” *Id.*
- 22 • “The hardware (at all levels) was a second class citizen.” *Id.*

23 When asked by litigation counsel to verify the information downloaded from the SVN one  
24 day before Waymo filed its complaint, Mr. Zbrozek conveyed to counsel his concerns with their  
25 conclusions of misconduct, [REDACTED]

26 [REDACTED] Vu Decl. Ex. 4. Despite Mr. Zbrozek’s expressed  
27 concerns, Waymo filed its complaint the next day and told the Court a different story.

28 **II. WAYMO HID MR. ZBROZEK AND KEY DOCUMENTS FROM DISCOVERY**

1 On March 11, 2017, Waymo filed a motion for preliminary injunction and did not submit a  
 2 declaration from Mr. Zbrozek. Instead, Gary Brown and Michael Janosko submitted declarations,  
 3 but later admitted that they had never accessed the SVN server and lacked personal knowledge. Vu  
 4 Decl. Ex. 8; Ex 9 [REDACTED]

5 [REDACTED]  
 6 [REDACTED].

7 Waymo also excluded Mr. Zbrozek from its three initial disclosures, first served on April 3,  
 8 2017 and amended twice by June 22, 2017, and did not collect his email or documents. *Id.* at Exs.  
 9 11, 12, 13. In response to Otto Trucking' 30(b)(6) Topics regarding the SVN server and  
 10 preservation of logs generated by the server, instead of designating Mr. Zbrozek, Waymo designated  
 11 Gary Brown, who was not adequately prepared on SVN server issues. Judge Corley found that Mr.  
 12 Brown was unprepared and required that he be deposed again on the failure to preserve the SVN  
 13 logs. *See* 08/28/17 Hr'g Tr. 46:12-20. This situation could have been avoided had Mr. Zbrozek  
 14 been designated instead of hidden.

15 Waymo also used the attorney-client privilege as a sword and shield to disclose self-serving  
 16 aspects of its forensic investigation, while hiding damaging communications, like those with Mr.  
 17 Zbrozek, from discovery. *See* Dkt. 1272. Defendants did not receive unredacted versions of many  
 18 critical documents regarding Waymo's investigation until September 2, 2017 (*i.e.* Vu Decl. Exhibits  
 19 1-6), after the discovery cut-off, after key depositions had been taken, and after several rounds of  
 20 motion practice. After Judge Corley found Waymo had waived this privilege on August 18, 2017,  
 21 Otto Trucking has had to request the Court's assistance in forcing Waymo to comply with the  
 22 Court's order four additional times, the most recent on September 6, when Waymo improperly  
 23 continued to shield communications that were part of its privilege waiver. Dkt. 1479.

24 **III. THE COURT SHOULD EXCLUDE MENTION OF THE DOWNLOADING OF THE**  
**25 14,000 FILES OR THAT THE DOWNLOADING WAS ANOMALOUS**

26 Discovery has shown that the downloading of the 14,000 files is irrelevant to Waymo's  
 27 purported trade secret claim. Waymo has admitted that its claims require the taking of trade secrets,  
 28 not merely confidential or proprietary information. *See* 4/12/17 Hr'g at 116:6-117:4. The

1 administrator of the SVN server had repeatedly informed Waymo that he believed the material to be  
 2 “low-value.” In addition, Mr. Zbrozek made clear that the act of downloading the 14,000 documents  
 3 itself was not evidence of misconduct, as downloading the entire repository was regular practice.  
 4 Thus, the Court should exclude reference to the downloading of the 14,000 files as irrelevant, and/or  
 5 because its probative value is outweighed by a danger of prejudice and confusing the issues. Fed. R.  
 6 Evid. 401-403; *Mattel, Inc. v. MGA Entertainment, Inc.*, 2011 WL 13128621 at \* 3 (C.D. Cal. Jan.  
 7 26, 2011) (excluding alleged misappropriation of non-trade secrets as “Mattel’s improper argument  
 8 that the download of non-trade secret information was somehow wrongful.”)

9       Waymo has misrepresented the importance of these 14,000 files all the while hiding a  
 10 knowledgeable witness who had expressed his discomfort regarding Waymo’s contrived narrative.  
 11 Waymo has also improperly asserted privilege over its investigation and stonewalled after the Court  
 12 ordered Waymo to produce its privileged communications about its investigation. This stonewalling  
 13 significantly delayed the discovery of the critical documents including those relating to Mr.  
 14 Zbrozek’s disagreement with Waymo’s claim. The Court should prevent further prejudice and the  
 15 risk of misleading or confusing the jury. Fed. R. Evid. 403; *Monterey Bay Military Housing, LLC v.*  
 16 *Pinnacle Monterey LLC*, 2015 WL4593439, at \*9 (N.D. Cal. July 30, 2015) (excluding  
 17 characterization that alleged conduct was harmful as misleading and lacking in foundation).

18       In the alternative, to the extent that the Court permits reference to the 14,000 files, Waymo  
 19 should be precluded from any suggestion that this downloading was anomalous. Any such argument  
 20 is based on incomplete evidence. Waymo failed to preserve SVN log information for Mr.  
 21 Levandowski or other employees prior to September 19, 2015. Waymo has also refused to produce  
 22 any other log data for the numerous devices used by Mr. Levandowski. With only four months of  
 23 SVN data for Mr. Levandowski and no contemporary logs for other engineers, there is insufficient  
 24 basis to determine whether this behavior was anomalous or worthy of suspicion. *See* Ex. 7. Further,  
 25 Waymo refused to provide other requested log data for Mr. Levandowski or log data for a sampling  
 26 of other Waymo employees. Dkt. 1317 at 3. This information is also relevant to determine if Mr.  
 27 Levandowski’s behavior is anomalous. Waymo has refused to provide context for the alleged  
 28 downloading; it should be precluded from presenting evidence that such conduct was suspicious.

1  
2 Dated: September 7, 2017

3 By: /s/ Neel Chatterjee  
4 Neel Chatterjee  
nchatterjee@goodwinlaw.com  
Brett Schuman  
bschuman@goodwinlaw.com  
Shane Brun  
sbrun@goodwinlaw.com  
Rachel M. Walsh  
rwalsh@goodwinlaw.com  
Hong-An Vu  
hvu@goodwinlaw.com  
Hayes P. Hyde  
hhyde@goodwinlaw.com  
James Lin  
jlin@goodwinlaw.com  
**GOODWIN PROCTER LLP**

5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 *Attorneys for Defendant: Otto Trucking LLC*

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## **PROOF OF SERVICE**

I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action. My business address is: 601 S Figueroa Street, 41st Floor, Los Angeles, California 90017.

**On September 7, 2017**, I served the following documents by placing a true copy thereof in a sealed envelope(s) on the persons below as follows:

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 26 TO EXCLUDE REFERENCE TO  
DOWNLOADING OF 14,000 FILES**

Charles K. Verhoeven  
David A. Perlson  
Melissa Baily  
John Neukom  
Jordan Jaffe  
**QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &**  
**SULLIVAN, LLP**  
50 California Street, 22nd Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4788

Counsel for Plaintiff: *Waymo LLC*  
Telephone: 415.875.6600  
Facsimile: 415.875.6700  
*QE-Waymo@quinnmanuel.com*

David Cooper  
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP  
51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor,  
New York, New York 10010

Counsel for Plaintiff: *Waymo LLC*  
Telephone: 212.849.7000  
Facsimile: 212.849.7100  
*QE-Waymo@quinnmanuel.com*

Leo P. Cunningham  
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI  
650 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050

Counsel for Plaintiff: *Waymo LLC*  
Telephone: 650.493.9300  
Facsimile: 650.493.6811  
*lcunningham@wsgr.com*

Arturo J. Gonzalez  
Daniel Pierre Muino  
Eric Akira Tate  
Esther Kim Chang  
Matthew Ian Kreeger  
Michael A. Jacobs  
**MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP**  
425 Market Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.* and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 415.268.7000  
Facsimile: 415.268.7522  
*UberWaymoMoFoAttorneys@mofo.com*

Michelle Ching Youn Yang  
MORRISON FOERSTER LLP  
2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.* and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 202.887.1500  
Facsimile: 202.887.0763  
UberWaymoMoFoAttorneys@mofo.com

Rudolph Kim  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
755 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.* and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 650.813.5600  
Facsimile: 650.494.0792  
UberWaymoMoFoAttorneys@mofo.com

1 Wendy Joy Ray  
2 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
3 707 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 6000  
4 Los Angeles, CA 90017

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.* and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 213.892.5200  
Facsimile: 213.892.5454  
UberWaymoMoFoAttorneys@mofo.com

5 Michael Darron Jay  
6 BOIES SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
7 401 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 850  
8 Santa Monica, CA 90401

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.* and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 310.752.2400  
Facsimile: 310.752.2490  
BSF\_EXTERNAL\_UberWaymoLit@bsfllp.co  
m

9 Meredith Richardson Dearborn  
10 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
11 435 Tasso Street, Suite 205  
12 Palo Alto, CA 94301

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.* and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 650.445.6400  
Facsimile: 650.329.8507  
BSF\_EXTERNAL\_UberWaymoLit@bsfllp.co  
m

13 Hamish Hume  
14 Jessica E Phillips  
15 Karen Leah Dunn  
16 Kyle N. Smith  
17 Martha Lea Goodman  
18 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
19 1401 New York Ave., NW  
20 Washington, DC 20005

Counsel for Defendants: *Uber Technologies Inc.* and *Ottomotto LLC*  
Telephone: 202.237.2727  
Facsimile: 202.237.6131  
BSF\_EXTERNAL\_UberWaymoLit@bsfllp.co  
m

21 John L. Cooper  
22 FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP  
23 235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor  
24 San Francisco, CA 94104

Appointed by Court as: *Special Master*  
Telephone: 415.954.4410  
Facsimile: 415.954.4480  
jcooper@fbm.com

25

- (MAIL). I placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this firm's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid. I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Los Angeles, California.
- (OVERNIGHT DELIVERY). I deposited in a box or other facility regularly maintained by FedEx, an express service carrier, or delivered to a courier or driver authorized by said express service carrier to receive documents, a true copy of the foregoing document in sealed envelopes or packages designated by the express service carrier, addressed as stated above, with fees for overnight delivery paid or provided for.
- (E-MAIL or ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION). Based on a court order or *an agreement of the parties to accept service by e-mail or electronic transmission*, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the e-mail addresses listed. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.

1 I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.  
2 Executed on **September 7, 2017**, at Los Angeles, California.

3  
4 \_\_\_\_\_  
5 Hong-An Vu  
(Type or print name)

6 \_\_\_\_\_  
7 /s/Hong-An Vu  
8 (Signature)  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28